DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 885 HE 019 250

AUTHOR Twombly, Susan B.
TITLE Boundaries of the Top-Level Two-Year College Administrative Labor Market: Implications for Leadership and Cooperation. ASHE 1986 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (San Antonio, TX, February 20-23, 1986). For related document, see HE 019 249.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *Administrators; Business; Career Ladders; College Administration; *College Presidents; Employment Experience; Higher Education; Industry; Leadership Responsibility; National Surveys; *Occupational Mobility; Promotion (Occupational); *School Business Officials; Seniority; *Student Personnel Workers; *Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

Occupational mobility for top-level, two-year college administrators was determined, with attention to movement between different types of postsecondary institutions as well as hiring from outside academia. The focuses on college presidents, chief academic officers, chief student affairs officers, and chief business officers. Findings are interpreted within the context of internal labor market theory, which offers a framework for explaining administrator mobility. Data were obtained from a 1984 national study of two-year college administrators' careers. Results indicate that the labor markets for presidents, chief academic officers, and chief student affairs officers were relatively closed to individuals from external positions and from four-year institutions. These boundaries were more open at earlier stages of careers. The position of chief business officer, however, was much more open to administrators from external sources. It appears that one way in which two-year colleges protect their employees, and perhaps induce organizational commitment, is by holding out top-level positions for those from within the two-year college labor market. Boundaries of an administrative labor market can have important implications for individuals, the two-year college, and for postsecondary education. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED268885

Boundaries of the Top-Level Two-Year College Administrative Labor Market: Implications for Leadership and Cooperation

Susan B. Twombly

The University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, Texas, February 20-23, 1986.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan B. Twombly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 019 250

ASHE Association for the Study of Higher Education
The George Washington University/One Dupont Circle, Suite 630/Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Gunter Hotel in San Antonio, Texas, February 20-23, 1986. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Boundaries of the Top-Level Two-Year College Administrative Labor Market: Implications for Leadership and Cooperation

Abstract

Data from a national study of two-year college administrators' careers were used to determine the boundaries of the top-level two-year college administrative labor market within the context of internal labor market theory. Results indicated that the labor markets for presidents, chief academic officers, and chief student affairs officers were relatively closed to individuals from external positions and from four-year institutions; these boundaries were more open at earlier stages of careers. The position of chief business officer was much more open to administrators from external sources. Implications of the findings for individuals, for the two-year college, and for postsecondary education are discussed.

In the 60s and 70s when two-year colleges were being founded and existing colleges were growing at tremendous rates, there were two major concerns about administrators: would there be enough administrators with an understanding of and commitment to the special mission of the two-year college, and where would these administrators be found? Scholars of the movement suggested that the two-year college itself was the best source of administrative potential while others cautioned against lack of innovation that would be conditioned by selecting administrators mainly from within two-year colleges. Current discussion suggests that the labor market for two-year college administrators is closed; and that most top and mid-level two-year college administrators are selected from within the two-year college.[1]

The focus of this study was the sources of current two-year college presidents, chief academic officers, chief student affairs officers and chief business officers. Particular attention was given to the extent to which top-level administrators were selected from previous postsecondary positions (versus positions outside of postsecondary education); and more specifically, to the extent to which administrators have held previous positions in two-year colleges. In other words, are there boundaries to the two-year college administrative labor market? Most earlier discussions of movement between different types of postsecondary institutions have been couched in terms of social stratification and institutional prestige. The results of the present study were analyzed within the context of internal labor market theory which offers a more useful framework for explaining administrator mobility.

The question of labor market boundaries is important for the contemporary two-year college. The roots of the American two-year college in both the public schools and the universities have been well documented. A legitimate segment of postsecondary education, the two-year college has traditionally maintained close relations with both public schools and universities.

---

[1] Throughout this paper the term two-year college encompasses both public community colleges and independent junior colleges, and technical colleges. Furthermore, to the extent that one can assume that two-year colleges are more like each other than they are like other types of organizations, two-year college refers to two-year colleges in general and not to any one college. For the purposes of this paper, the labor market for two-year college administrators is assumed to be one labor market divided by position type.

More recently as two-year colleges separated from control of the local school system, the local community has become the most important frame of reference for the vast majority of two-year colleges. Control by local boards of trustees is a highly valued characteristic of two-year colleges. Even in states in which community colleges are under a highly centralized form of governance at the state level (e.g., Virginia), the mission of the modern community college necessitates close ties with the local community. From offering free and easy access to two years of postsecondary education for the populace as advocated by the Truman Commission (1947) to becoming an integral part of community activity (Gleazer, 1980), during the ensuing forty years community colleges have become much more closely involved with the lives of their host communities in the past forty years.

Leaders at both the local and national level have played very important roles in transforming the two-year college from fledgling status to its current position as a full partner in postsecondary education (Martorana, 1985). Furthermore, in their new book Dale Tillery and William Deegan (1985) suggested that a relationship between previous work experience and locations of administrators and articulation between two-year colleges and local schools or four-year colleges and universities exists. As they pointed out, for example, relationships between the early two-year colleges and local schools were good when administrators carried on the traditions and training of school principals. However, relations with schools declined and improved with colleges and universities as two-year colleges separated from control of the local schools and began the search for their own identity. Articulation between two-year colleges and both public schools and four year institutions declined during the 70s as two-year colleges came into their own and as they gained a place as a legitimate component of postsecondary education (Tillery and Deegan, 1985). In light of the Tillery and Deegan observations, we must wonder whether a closed labor market facilitated a deterioration in articulation and whether a closed market contributes to its maintenance.

There has been little recent attempt to identify the sources of two-year college administrators although it is commonly believed that the two-year college has indeed become its

own best source of administrators. For support for this claim we are forced to turn to studies done during the late 1960s. Roberts (1964), Schultz (1965), Ferrari and Berte (1970), and Wing (1971) noted the propensity for public two-year college presidents to be selected from positions within two-year colleges. Each of the authors cited above reported that a small proportion of presidents had held their most immediate previous position in four-year colleges and universities, but approximately one-quarter of the presidents in each study came from positions in the public schools. These studies were all done on presidents in public two-year colleges, and furthermore they were done on the early edge of the tremendous growth spurt which characterized two-year colleges in the 60s and 70s. Based on a study done by Johnston (1965), it appears that private two-year college presidents were more likely to come from four-year college positions and from positions outside of postsecondary education than were their public counterparts). In the wake of leveling off in growth of two-year colleges, interest in sources of supply of administrators and their career patterns in general has declined. Consequently, there is no recent empirical support for the belief that the administrative labor market in two-year colleges has become increasingly closed to individuals from four-year insitutions or from positions outside of postsecondary education.

Early investigators of mobility of personnel among different types of postsecondary institutions have assumed that colleges and universities constitute a stratification hierarchy, and resulting discussions of interinstitutional mobility have been couched in terms of institutional prestige. Caplow and McGee (1958) illustrated the order of prestige in the hierarchy through their famous baseball metaphor: the major league (major research universities); minor league (lesser research and comprehensive insitutions); bush league (small private liberal arts colleges); and academic siberia (two-year colleges). Both Caplow and McGee and Brown (1967) found barriers to movement of faculty among types of postsecondary institutions, and they each explained this phenomenon in terms of institutional prestige and familiarity with institutional mission associated with a particular type of postsecondary institution. Birnbaum (1970) found that institutions tended to select presidents from institutions similar in type to their own. And he

employed the concept of exchange value to explain the mobility among differing types of institutions that did occur. Thus a move might occur from a lower level position at a more prestigious institution to a higher level position at a less prestigious institution. Conversely movement from the presidency of a lower prestige institution to a lower position at a more prestigious institution would also be considered a form of upward mobility. While interesting, explanations of interinstitutional mobility based on social stratification framework are of limited value in explaining the role of careers in organizational functioning. Internal labor market theory offers a more useful framework within which to analyze administrator mobility among differing types of postsecondary education organizations which, in turn,helps to define the boundaries of administrator labor markets.

All organizations, including colleges and universities, are faced with the continual task of providing trained and experienced individuals (as defined by the organization) who are ready to assume top leadership positions (Martin and Strauss, 1956). From the perspective of internal labor market theory, organizations seek to do this as effectively and efficiently as possible. In part this is accomplished by the development over time of job ladders or career lines (Doeringer and Piore, 1971; Althauser and Kalleberg, 1981). Positions become arranged in sequences that assure that incumbents in lower positions receive training for succeeding positions before actually assuming these positions, and job selection is structured accordingly. In this manner, costs of adjustment to new positions are minimized for both individuals and for organizations.

Job ladders or career lines offer employment security for individuals and motivate employees to perform by holding out the promise of advancement (Glaser, 1968; Sorensen and Kalleberg, 1981). Fixed entry positions restrict entry to internal labor markets, and to career lines; and thus promotion opportunities are ideally restricted to those within the labor market. However, promotion opportunities loose some of their effectiveness as a source of motivation if high level positions are available to individuals from outside markets (Sorensen and Kalleberg, 1981). Thus boundaries of a labor market are important in identifying who is included in the

competition for advancement to leadership positions, and what some of the barriers to entry in a labor market might be.

Boundaries of organization have further importance. In his discussion of organizational boundaries Scott (1981) identified three indicators of membership boundaries: normative indicators such as interaction rates that locate boundaries where interaction shows "thin places" (Homans in Scott, 1981); nature or content of organization activities accompanied by spatial boundaries such as a campus and temporal boundaries such as semesters; and gradient of influence. In the present study "thin places" or signs of less interorganizational mobility were the most appropriate indicator of membership boundaries.

Membership boundaries serve differing functions depending on whether one views organizations from a rational or natural perspective (Scott, 1981). From a rational perspective, boundary defining characteristics insulate the organization from the environment and they contribute to organizational rationality (Scott, 1981). Highly controlled recruitment criteria are but one important mechanism for insulating the organization from its environment. From a natural system perspective, it is not possible to completely shut out the external environment. In this view, external identities of participants are considered a primary resource for the organization by which skills, legitimacy and connections with the larger social environment are fostered (Scott, 1981, p. 184).

The issue of identifying the boundaries of the top-level two-year college administrator labor market(s) was addressed in this study by determining the extent to which administrators rose to their current positions directly from positions in postsecondary institutions and more specifically from positions in two- or four-year institutions. Based on the trends noted among presidents in the 1960s, it was hypothesized that the administrative labor market in two-year colleges would give preference to individuals from within two-year colleges, and that consequently the labor market would be closed to those individuals from external and four-year markets.

What are the implications of a closed market for an institution that prides itself on maintaining close relationships with public schools, colleges and universities, and the community,

and on being innovative and flexible? The results are discussed in terms of how two-year colleges protect their own for advancement to top-level positions. Implications of the results for cooperation between two-year colleges and their traditional friends--the public schools and colleges and universities are discussed. In addition questions of implications of a closed labor market for an evolving two-year college mission are posed.

Method

The vita portion of a 1984 national study of two-year college administrators' careers served as the data source for the study.[2] A thirty-five percent random sample of each selected administrative position (presidents, chief academic officers, chief student affairs officers, and chief business officers) at all regionally accredited public and private two-year colleges was drawn. An overall usuable response rate of 75 percent resulted in the following sample sizes: presidents--193; chief academic officers--271; chief student affairs officers--221; chief business officers--207. Each respondent reported up to ten previous professional positions. For each position, a variety of information was coded including the position type and the institution type, including the type of external organization in which a job was held. A taxonomy of postsecondary institution types developed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems was used to code the type of postsecondary education institution.[3]

Data analysis proceeded as follows: 1) Positions held immediately prior to the current positions (hereafter called the first previous position) were analyzed separately for each group of administrators to determine the proportion of administrators who held these positions in postsecondary institutions and the proportion who held this first previous position outside of postsecondary education. A subsequent frequency distribution indicated what type of external

---

[2] The study, entitled Today's Academic Leaders: A National Study of Administrators in Community and Junior Colleges, was carried out in the Spring of 1984 by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at The Pennsylvania State University under the direction of Dr. Kathryn M. Moore.

[3] The NCHEMS taxonomy of institutional types was selected over the more familiar Carnegie taxonomy because the NCHEMS system differentiates among types of two-year colleges based on the range of programs offered.

positions were most common for each group of administrators. 2) For those administrators in each administrative sample who held a postsecondary first previous position, the proportion holding two-year versus four-year first previous positons was determined. 3) The proportion of each administrative group which held positions at four-year colleges and universities at some point in their careers was determined.

Results

As revealed in Table 1, the majority of each group of administrators moved to their current positions from positions in postsecondary education institutions--either two-year or four-year. It follows that relatively few came directly to their current positions from outside of postsecondary education. Furthermore, the numbers of presidents, chief academic officers, and chief student affairs officers holding their first previous position outside of postsecondary education are somewhat misleading. In each case a substantial portion have held earlier positions within colleges or universities. As a result only 19 presidents, 15 chief academic officers, and 22 chief student affairs officers were 'lifelong' outsiders, having held no previous professional positions within postsecondary education.

Chief business officers are quite different from their administrative counterparts. A much larger proportion of chief business officers came to their current post from positions outside of postsecondary education than did administrators in other positions. Most of the75 who came from these outside positions are lifelong outsiders as only 8 had held college or university positions at some earlier point in their careers.

Insert Table 1 About Here

The first part of the analysis indicates that the vast majority of appointments to top-level administrative positions in two-year colleges were made from within postsecondary labor markets. The two-year college labor market for presidents, chief academic officers, and chief

student affairs officers appears to be relatively closed to individuals from outside markets. This is reinforced by the fact that even a goodly number of those whose first previous position was outside higher education have held earlier positions in colleges or universities. The chief business officer position is much more open to individuals from outside markets.

What external markets were most likely to serve as direct sources of the administrators in this study? Presidents whose first previous position was outside of postsecondary education (n=31) were most likely to have been school administrators (15) or to have held positions with some type of education agency (9). The other 7 held a variety of other external positions. Externally selected chief academic officers (n=29) were most likely selected from education agencies (15) or from school administration (6). Again 8 held a variety of other types of positions in external markets. As might be expected, chief student affairs officers who came directly from outside markets (n=32) were most likely to have held school administration (14) or teaching, counseling or coaching positions (9). The remaining nine externally selected chief student affairs officers held a variety of types of posts. Somewhat surprisingly school administration (22) was a prominent external source of chief business officers (n=75), but 29 held first previous positions in business. The remaining chief business officers (24) held teaching, education agency and a variety of other external positions.

An apparent boundary was identified between two-year colleges and external environments as indicated by lack of movement of administrators directly from outside markets to top-level positions. To give further definition to the boundaries of the administrative labor market it was necessary to determine (from among those administrators who held first previous positions within postsecondary education) the proportion of administrators who held their first previous positions in two-year institutions. As the data in Table 2 reveal, approximately 90 percent of each of the four groups of administrators in this study who came from within postsecondary education came from positions in two-year colleges. It is clear from these data that two-year colleges give preference to "their own" when selecting personnel for at least the four top positions that are the focus of this study.

Insert Table 2 Here

While relatively small proportions of each administrative group moved directly to their current positions from positions in four-year institutions, a greater proportion of each group held at least one four-year college position at some point in their careers. See Table 3. Approximately 40 percent of the presidents, chief academic officers, and chief student affairs officers with postsecondary education experience in their background reported holding at least one position at a four-year college or university. However, less than one-quarter of the chief business officers have held earlier four-year college positions. While chief business officers were more likely than the other administrative groups to come directly from outside markets, those who did have postsecondary backgrounds were likely to be mobile within two-year colleges.

Insert Table 3

There are two possible explanations for these findings. The fact that such a large proportion of top administrators held at least one position in a "senior" institution may be an artifact of the time period covered by the careers of the administrators in this study. Many careers began in the 1960s and early 1970s when administrators were in great demand in the two-year college, and thus personnel movement from four-year to two-year colleges was common. On the other hand, it may be that it is, in fact, easier to make interinstitutional type moves earlier in one's career. Unfortunately the present study does not resolve this issue. It can only spark our curiosity.

In summary, based on these data it appears that mobility of administrators to top-level positions (particularly presidents, chief academic officers, and chief student affairs officers) occurs largely within postsecondary education and more specifically within two-year colleges. The administrative labor market for presidents, chief academic officers and chief student affairs

officers is relatively closed. Thus we can conclude that there are boundaries to this labor market at the level of the position immediately preceding the current position. As noted a substantial proportion of each administrative group held one or more positions in four-year institutions at some point in their careers suggesting that the labor market for top-level two-year college administrators may be more open, or the boundaries less defined at lower levels in the organizational hierarchy or earlier in administrative careers. The labor market for chief business officers is considerably more open to individuals from outside markets, and thus the boundaries are less well defined. Furthermore, those chief business officers who have built careers within postsecondary education have largely done so within two-year colleges.

Discussion

From the perspective of the social stratification framework offered by Caplow and McGee (1958) and Brown (1967) it might have been expected, particularly in light of a tight labor market, that four-year institutions would have been a more prominent immediate source of top-level two-year college administrators. This expectation would be based on the argument that two-year colleges are low on the prestige totem pole and that downward movement occurs more readily than upward mobility. From the perspective of the two-year college it could be argued that it would be advantageous to hire administrators from the more prestigious colleges and universities: That prestige would follow individuals. The fact that there was apparently little mobility from four-year college positions to two-year positions at high levels in the organizational hierarchy might be explained from the point of view that individuals do not want to lower their own prestige value, particularly if anticipating further moves or that people with common values gravitate toward like institutions. Viewing the issue from the perspective of social stratification is of limited utility, and furthermore it portrays two-year colleges in an unfavorable light. While none can dispute the fact that two-year colleges are different from their four-year counterparts in many respects, this does not mean that, for whatever reason, they should be viewed as lesser institutions.

The results reported in this study do indeed confirm the widely held belief that the labor market for top-level administrative positions in the two-year college is relatively closed. Preference is given in selection of individuals to fill top-level positions to persons from within postsecondary education and more specifically from within two-year colleges. The same preference at earlier points in careers of administrators does not appear to occur. How can these results be explained and what purpose does a closed market serve? Concepts from internal labor market theory related earlier are useful in interpreting the results reported here.

Job ladders work, in part, because they offer employment security to employees and they motivate individuals to become committed to the organization. In an ideal-type internal labor market employees can only enter a market or job ladder through a low-level fixed entry position. Once in the market, then, outside persons are not a source of competition for jobs. However, if positions are open to individuals from external markets then the advantages of internal labor markets for employees are weakened.

The occupational internal labor market of two-year college administrators is not characterized by highly structured career lines or by fixed entry positions (although types of entry positions can be identified). That is, while there are a few career lines leading to each of the top positions that are the focus of this study, they do not resemble the highly structured career lines which one might find in a civil service type organization (Twombly, 1985). So while some positions can be identified as important training for top-level positions, it is not entirely clear that individuals will be motivated to perform by the somewhat amorphous career lines that exist in two-year colleges.[4]

However, it does appear that one way in which two-year colleges protect their employees, and perhaps induce orgainzational commitment, is by holding out top-level positions for those from within the two-year college labor market. This is efficient for two-year colleges as an organization, for even though individuals may not come from one or two specific positions,

[4]It is not the intention of the author to suggest that lack of highly structured job ladders is bad. Considering that colleges are populated with professionals partially structured career lines might be expected and in fact, preferred.

individuals from within have presumably been socialized to the particular values and mission of the two-year college. In addition, internal selection from within two-year colleges, insulates two-year colleges from their environment through administrative selection criteria.

At the same time employees may be motivated by the notion that they will not be competing with individuals from external markets. This protection does not appear to occur at earlier stages in the careers of top administrators as substantial proportions have held positions in four-year institutions, and outside of postsecondary education. When making this statement we must keep in mind the caveat issued earlier concerning the overlapping of careers and history of the two-year college. Boundaries of labor markets, then, have consequences for the functioning of organizations.

What are the implications of the boundaries identified in this study for two-year colleges? Some of the implications apply to individuals. The chances of moving from a position outside of postsecondary education or from a position in a four-year institution directly to a top-level position in a two-year college are not very good, but they are better if one is seeking a position as a chief business officer. However, the data also suggest that mobility from external or four-year college markets is more prevalent at earlier stages in careers. Nor are the traditional external sources of administrators as prevalent as they once were. Very few top administrators are selected directly to their current positions from positions in school administration, although again the chief business officer position is somewhat of an exception. School administration has declined as an immediate source of top-level administrators, although such positions may have been held earlier in careers. It appears that access to two-year college administrative careers must be gained relatively early in careers.

For the purposes of this study it is the implications of a closed market for the two-year college and its relationships with other segments of postsecondary education that are of most concern. On the one hand a closed market in which trustees and institutions do not have to look to four-year colleges, to the public schools, or to business for their top-level administrators is a sign of maturity. Two-year colleges can indeed provide administrators from within their own ranks. Furthermore, it may be optimally efficient for two-year colleges to be able to select

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

administrators who are experienced in and committed to the values and mission of the two-year college. Previous experience in the two-year college reduces the need for some training associated with adjustment to a new position. In addition, a preference for top administrators with two-year college experience serves to insulate the two-year college from the external environment, and thus contributes to the maintenance of a unique identity.

But , on the other hand, does a closed labor market best serve the open, innovative, cooperative character of two-year colleges? Two-year colleges have long been thought of as institutions which are open to broad segments of society. Relations with the public schools, colleges and universities, and more recently local communities have been and continue to be of paramount importance to two-year colleges. In addition, flexibility and innovativeness have long been hallmarks of two-year colleges. One can not help but wonder whether a closed labor market is in part the cause of weakened articulation which has been observed recently among the above mentioned groups (Tillery and Deegan, 1985). Individuals with a predominantly two-year college experience and outlook may be less prone to understand the viewpoints of other organizations.

Furthermore, this question can be extended to coordination and cooperation at state levels. During times of decreasing resources, concern for quality and accountability, and declining enrollments, coordination and cooperation among the various segments of postsecondary education and significant others are critical. However, is cooperation facilitated or deterred by closed administrative labor markets? One can only peculate that a labor market which almost exclusively favors its own will not facilitate cooperation by virtue of the fact that it will be more difficult to appreciate the concerns of the other parties.

Finally, there is widespread support for the notion that the mission of the two-year college is changing toward a more community-centered mission. Martorana (1985) suggested that such a mission shift will necessitate leaders who are more than academic leaders. Rather they will need to be leaders for community development. If one accepts this argument, then it is appropriate to ask whether traditional sources of administrators are best suited to meet the challenge issued by Martorana. Twenty years ago Shannon (1966) expressed a concern that

overemphasis of selection of administrators from within two-year colleges would work against the innovative tradition of these insitutions. Are two-year colleges cheating themselves of new sources of innovation by predominantly favoring their own? This situation is far from unique and the very same question can be posed to four-year colleges and universities. In general institution type has posed barriers to administrator mobiltiy (Smolansky, 1984). However, the present study indicates that greater proportions of administrators move from two-year to four-year institutions than from four-year to two-year institutions (Moore and Twombly, 1985).

The source of administrators becomes a more important question when one thinks of a mission which is evolving toward a more community orientation. Perhaps external sources of administrators should be reconsidered as appropriate for facilitating a change in mission or effectively administering institutions with an increasingly community centered emphasis. Interestingly, one can also look to thee data reported here for indication of some ways that two-year colleges deal with the need to have an external focus. One way seems to be that while the boundaries for the presidency, chief academic officer, and chief student affairs officer are clearly defined, the the same is not true for chief business officers. Thus, the chief business officer position may serve as a vital link between the two-year college and its external environment. Another way in which relations with external constituencies are maintained is through participation in community activities. A high proportion of each of the administrative groups studied here participate in a variety of community activities. For presidents participation in these activities is particularly important (Moore, Twombly, & Martorana, 1985).

Regardless of how individuals, trustees or those involved with two-year colleges in general answer the questions posed by this study, the issue of the structure of administrator careers is an important factor to be considered in orgainzational functioning. Boundaries are but one aspect of career structures, and, as this study demonstrates, boundaries of an administrative labor market can have important implications for individuals and for the organization.

References

Althauser, R., & Kalleberg, A. (1981). Firms, occupations, and the structure of labor markets: A conceptual analysis. In I. Berg (Ed.), Sociological Perspectives on Labor Markets. New York: Academic Press.

Birnbaum, R. (1970). Presidential succession: An interinstitutional analysis. Educational Record, 52, 1971, 133-151.

Brown, D. (1967). The mobile professors. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Caplow, T., and McGee, R. (1958). The academic marketplace. New York: Basic Books.

Doringer, P., & Piore, M. (1971). Internal labor markets and manpower analysis. Lexington, MA: Heath Lexington Books.

Ferrari, M., & Berte, N. (1970). American junior colleges: Leadership and crucial issues for the1970's. Washington, DC: American Associationof Community and Junior Colleges.

Glaser, B. (1968). Organizational careers: A sourcebook for theory. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Gleazer, E. G. (1980). The American community college: Values, vision and vitality. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Johnston, A. (1965). Private junior college administrators: An analysis of their backgrounds and a twelve-year prediction of future needs (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1965). Dissertation Abstracts International, 26, 1449.

Martin, N., & Strauss, A. (1956). Patterns of mobility within industrial organizations. Journal of Business, 29(2), 101-110.

Martorana, S. V. (1985). Implications for high leadership: The *sine qua non* for the "movement". In K. Moore, S. Twombly, and S. V. Martorana, Today's Academic Leaders: A National Study of Administrators in Community and Junior Colleges. University Park: Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

Moore, K., & Twombly, S. (1985). Administrator mobility: Crossing the boundary between two-year and four-year colleges and universities. The Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Roberts, D. (1964). Chief administrators of public junior colleges: A predictionof the number needed and sources of supply, 1963-1973 (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1964). Dissertation Abstracts International, 25, 5074.

Schultz, R. (1965). Administrators for America's junior colleges: Predictions of need, 1965-1980. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Scott, W. R. (1981). Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Shannon, W. (1966). The community college president: A study of the role of president of the public community junior college (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University).

Smolansky, B. (1984). Job transition behavior in the labor market for administrators in higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park).

Sorensen, A., & Kalleberg, A. (1981). A theory of matching persons to jobs. In I. Berg (Ed.), Sociological Perspectives on Labor Markets. New York: Academic Press.

Tillery, D., & Deegan, W. (1985). Renewing the American community college: Priorities and strategies for effective leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Twombly, S. (1985). The structure of careers of top-level two-year college administrators: An internal labor market approach. (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park).

Wing, D. (1971). The public community college chief administrator during the 1960's (Doctoral disseration, University of Colorado, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 1822A.

Table 1

Sector of Employment of First Previous Position
of Two-Year College Administrators

Position	Sector of Employment: Postsecondary Education	Sector of Employment: Outside	Total
President	.839 (162)	.161 (31)	193
Chief Academic Officer	.892 (239)	.108 (29)	268
Chief Student Affairs Officer	.885 (188)	.145 (32)	220
Chief Business Officer	.630 (128)	.369 (75)	203

Table 2

Type of Postsecondary Institution of Employment for First Previous Position of Two-Year College Administrators

	Type of Postsecondary Institution		
Position	Two-Year	Four-Year	Total
President	.864 (140)	.136 (22)	162
Chief Academic Officer	.895 (214)	.105 (25)	239
Chief Student Affairs Officer	.840 (158)	.160 (30)	188
Chief Business Officer	.906 (116)	.094 (12)	128

Table 3

Proportion of Administrators With Previous
Postsecondary Experience Holding Four-Year Postions
At Some Point in Their Careers

Position	Proportion/No. with Four-Year Positions	No. with Postsecondary Experience
President	.448 (78)	174
Chief Academic Officer	.400 (102)	253
Chief Student Affairs Officer	.374 (74)	198
Chief Business Officer	.228 (31)	136